



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,977	02/08/2002	Curtis W. Hallowell	47171-00344USP1	6224
30223	7590	12/11/2003	EXAMINER	
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C. 225 WEST WASHINGTON SUITE 2600 CHICAGO, IL 60606			BOWER, KENNETH W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,977

Applicant(s)

HALLOWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth W Bower

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed on 5 July, 2002 and 21 July, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

NOTE: Examiner appreciates the cooperative effort of applicant in the development of a catalogue of references related to applicant's art. However the IDS of the instant application appears to contain references neither included in the catalogue nor with printed copies included in the application. Applicant should indicate those IDS references that are included in the catalogue and supply copies of the rest.

2. The information disclosure statement filed 5 July, 2002 and 21 July, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

3. Also the MPEP section addressing "PARTS, FORMS, and CONTENT of the APPLICATION" at Page 600-123 states: "Although a concise explanation of the relevance of the information is not required for English language information, applicants are encouraged to provide a concise explanation of why English-language information is being submitted and why it is considered to be relevant. Concise explanations (especially those which point out the relevant pages and lines) are helpful to the office, particularly where documents are lengthy and complex and applicant is aware of a section that is highly relevant to patentability or where a large number of documents are submitted and applicant is aware that one or more are highly relevant to patentability."

4. NOTE: Applicant is also requested to withdraw submission of documents that are not relevant to the examination of the instant application. While the benefit of the extensive study (12,00 pages of review) required to select the references to be submitted is appreciated applicant must appreciate that the instant invention is directed to subject matter not easily identified in drawings and the submitted references constitute an estimated 12,000 pages, the reading of which by examiner could have the affect of diluting the search for related art in the patent and non-patent literature. It is expected that a very substantial number of the references can be withdrawn since the IDS as well as the rest of the application is obviously structured to support applications for multiple inventions.

5. NOTE: In the interest of compact prosecution examiner has electronically scanned the US patent numbers of IDS cited applications and used electronic search tools to perform a word search in leu of detailed reading of the estimated 12,000 pages of US patents. The key words used in the examination in combination are: (dynamic, dynamically, "on the fly"); (assign, assigned, assigning, assigns, assignment, reassign, re-assign, reassigned, re-assigned, reassigning, re-assigning, reassignment, re-assignment, reassigns, re-assigns, associate, associated, associating, associates, association, reassociate, re-associate, reassociated, re-associated, reassociating, re-associating, reassociates, re-associates, reassociation, re-association, designate, designated, designating, designates, designation, redesignate, re-designate, redesignated, re-designated, redesignating, re-designating, redesignates, re-designates, redesignation, re-designation, direct, directs, directed, directing, redirect, re-direct, redirected, re-directed, redirecting, re-directing, redirects, re-directs, program, programs, programmed, programming, reprogram, re-program, reprogrammed, re-programmed, reprogramming, re-programming, reprograms, re-programs, route, routed, routing, routes, rerout, re-rout, rerouted, re-routed, rerouting, re-routing, rerouts, re-routes); (bin bins, chute, chutes, compartment, compartment, hopper, hoppers, discharge, discharged, discharges, discharging, exit, exits, exiting, exited, output, outputs, pack, packs, receive, receiver, receiving, received, stack, stacks, stacked, stacking, stacker); (banknote, banknotes, bill, bills, certificate, certificates, check, checks, currency, money, note and notes). It would be helpful in

further examination if applicant would advise examiner of any additional key words describing the invention.

Specification

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

NOTE: Pages 79, line 29 – page 103 of the specification has been used to back up the claims in the instant application. The remainder of the specification is left for review in applications of like subject matter.

NOTE: The numerous drawings in this application contain multiple embodiments which are referred to in the specification but are not reflected in the brief description where all of the embodiments are referred to as “one embodiment”. The term “one embodiment is misleading because it neither says that all of the drawings are to a “single embodiment” nor does it specify that the drawings are to “multiple embodiments”. Correction is required.

The content of the section titled “Alternative Embodiments” describes over a hundred embodiments that are not referenced to the associated drawings, drawing reference numbers nor text of the remainder of the specification. Correction is required.

7. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

NOTE: The same title has been used in several of the applicants parent applications and does not differentiate the instant invention from the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 3653

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

9. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) as being invented by Wegesser (US 5,938,044).

Subject matter of claims was invented by Wegesser (discloses at column 1, line 14 to column 41 line 34) and assigned to Cummins-Allison. There is no common inventership between US 5,938,044 and the instant application, therefore, the inventors of the instant invention did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 6-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn (US 4,963,118).

Gunn (US 4,963,118) discloses all of the limitations of claims 6-34 regarding the concept of dynamic assignment of containers by a controller to accept currency of different denominations.

Gunn (US 4,963,118) lacks the application of the concepts to dealing with paper currency.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time of the invention to apply concepts applied to one type of currency to a second type of currency as suggested by Kaneko who sorts coins and paper currency in a single device in the purpose line 3.


Conclusion

12. Direct any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner to Kenneth W. Bower at ken.bower@uspto.gov or (703) 306-4546. Call the examiner immediately prior to sending an unofficial fax to (703) 308-0552 or (703) 308-2571 if fax is busy. The examiner is normally available from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM Eastern Time on Monday through Thursday and on

Art Unit: 3653

every second Friday. The official central facsimile number for all groups is (703) 872-9306. Status or general information queries should be directed to the Group Receptionist at (703) 308-1113. If necessary, the Group Receptionist can assist with contacting the examiner's supervisor.

Kenneth W. Bower
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3653



Kwb

21 November 2003

DONALD P. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600